

| | |
|---|------------|
| PREFACE | i |
| SUMMARY | iii |
| INTRODUCTION/OVERVIEW..... | iii |
| PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION | iv |
| Purpose | iv |
| Need | iv |
| PROJECT ALTERNATIVES | v |
| PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE | vi |
| ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER DISCUSSION..... | vii |
| Southern Alignment | vii |
| Four-Lane Tunnel Alternatives | vii |
| Street and Highway Operations Alternative..... | viii |
| Mass Transit | viii |
| Bikeway Tunnel Alternative..... | viii |
| FUNDING | viii |
| COSTS | ix |
| ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES | x |
| Air Quality/Ventilation..... | x |
| Construction | xi |
| Cultural Resources | xii |
| Geology/Seismicity | xii |
| Growth Inducement/Community Impact..... | xiii |
| Hazardous Waste | xiii |
| Hydrology/Floodplains..... | xiv |
| Water Quality | xiv |
| Natural Environment | xv |
| Noise/ Vibrations..... | xvii |
| Paleontology..... | xix |
| Section 4(f) Involvement..... | xix |
| Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities | xix |
| Visual/Aesthetics..... | xxi |
| Joint CEQA and NEPA Document..... | xxii |
| CHAPTER 1 PROPOSED PROJECT..... | 1 |
| 1.1 PURPOSE AND NEED | 1 |
| 1.1.1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1.2 Background..... | 1 |
| 1.1.3 Purpose of Proposed Caldecott Improvement Project | 5 |
| 1.1.4 Need for Proposed Improvement Project | 5 |
| 1.2 ALTERNATIVES | 13 |
| 1.2.1 Introduction | 13 |
| 1.2.2 Alternatives Development Process | 13 |
| 1.2.3 Project Description | 16 |
| 1.2.4 Project Alternatives | 16 |
| 1.2.5 Comparison of Alternatives 2N and 3N | 25 |
| 1.2.6 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Discussion..... | 27 |
| 1.3 PROJECT COST, FUNDING AND SCHEDULE..... | 34 |
| 1.3.1 Cost | 34 |
| 1.3.2 Funding..... | 36 |
| 1.3.3 Schedule..... | 37 |
| 1.4 PERMITS AND APPROVALS NEEDED | 37 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| CHAPTER 2 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES | 39 |
| 2.1 HUMAN ENVIRONMENT | 39 |
| 2.1.1 Land Use | 39 |
| 2.1.2 Growth | 48 |
| 2.1.3 Community Impacts | 52 |
| 2.1.4 Utilities/Emergency Services | 63 |
| 2.1.5 Traffic and Transportation/Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities | 65 |
| 2.1.6 Visual/Aesthetics | 92 |
| 2.1.7 Cultural Resources | 138 |
| 2.2 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT | 145 |
| 2.2.1 Hydrology and Floodplain | 145 |
| 2.2.2 Water Quality and Storm Water Runoff | 146 |
| 2.2.3 Climate/Topography/Geology/Soils/Seismic | 151 |
| 2.2.4 Paleontology | 157 |
| 2.2.5 Hazardous Waste/Materials | 161 |
| 2.2.6 Air Quality | 162 |
| 2.2.7 Ventilation | 169 |
| 2.2.8 Noise/Vibrations | 172 |
| 2.2.9 Energy | 194 |
| 2.3 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT | 194 |
| 2.3.1 Natural Communities | 199 |
| 2.3.2 Wetlands and Other Waters | 202 |
| 2.3.3 Trees and Other Mature Vegetation | 205 |
| 2.3.4 Invasive Species | 208 |
| 2.3.5 Threatened and Endangered Species | 210 |
| 2.3.6 Resource Management Plan for the Caldecott Wildlife Corridor | 220 |
| 2.4 CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS | 224 |
| 2.4.1 Construction Methodology | 224 |
| 2.4.2 Construction Staging | 224 |
| 2.4.3 Utilities/Emergency Services | 235 |
| 2.4.4 Traffic | 236 |
| 2.4.5 Water Quality | 237 |
| 2.4.6 Hazardous Waste/Materials | 237 |
| 2.4.7 Air Quality | 238 |
| 2.4.8 Noise | 238 |
| 2.4.9 Vibrations | 239 |
| 2.4.10 Visual/Aesthetics | 240 |
| 2.4.11 Biological Resources | 241 |
| 2.5 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS | 244 |
| 2.5.1 Regulatory Setting | 244 |
| 2.5.2 Projects Considered in the Cumulative Impacts Evaluation | 244 |
| 2.5.3 Related Projects | 245 |
| 2.5.4 Potential Cumulative Impacts | 248 |
| CHAPTER 3 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) EVALUATION | 269 |
| 3.1 DETERMINING SIGNIFICANCE UNDER CEQA | 269 |
| 3.1.1 CEQA Environmental Checklist | 270 |
| 3.1.2 Discussion of Significant Impacts Under CEQA | 270 |
| 3.1.3 Mitigation Measures For Significant Impacts Under CEQA | 270 |

| | | |
|-------------------|--|------------|
| 3.2 | CLIMATE CHANGE..... | 275 |
| 3.2.1 | Regulatory Setting | 275 |
| 3.2.2 | Affected Environment | 275 |
| CHAPTER 4 | COMMENTS AND COORDINATION..... | 279 |
| 4.1 | SCOPING MEETINGS | 279 |
| 4.2 | PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND COMMITTEES | 280 |
| 4.2.1 | Lead and Cooperating Agencies..... | 280 |
| 4.2.2 | Executive Steering Committee | 280 |
| 4.2.3 | Project Development Team (PDT) | 280 |
| 4.2.4 | Project Leadership Team (PLT) | 281 |
| 4.2.5 | Project Management Groups | 281 |
| 4.2.6 | Project Management Team (PMT) | 281 |
| 4.2.7 | Technical Review Committee (TRC) | 281 |
| 4.3 | AGENCY CONSULTATIONS..... | 281 |
| 4.3.1 | Agencies Contacted | 281 |
| 4.4 | PUBLIC PARTICIPATION..... | 282 |
| 4.4.1 | Public Meetings | 282 |
| 4.4.2 | Public Hearing and Circulation of the Draft EA/EIR | 282 |
| 4.4.3 | Public Hearing Format and Content | 283 |
| 4.4.4 | Project Web-Site..... | 284 |
| CHAPTER 5 | LIST OF PREPARERS | 285 |
| CHAPTER 6 | DISTRIBUTION LIST | 289 |
| Appendices | | A-1 |
| Appendix A: | Environmental Significance Checklist..... | A-3 |
| Appendix B: | Resources Evaluated Relative to the Requirements of Section 4(f) | A-13 |
| Appendix C: | Title VI Policy Statement..... | A-17 |
| Appendix D: | Minimization and/or Mitigation Summary..... | A-19 |
| Appendix E: | List of Acronyms | A-25 |
| Appendix F: | List of Technical Studies..... | A-31 |
| Appendix G: | Geotechnical Analysis | A-35 |
| Appendix H: | State Historic Preservation Office Concurrence | A-43 |
| Appendix I: | Preliminary Reasonableness Determination for Noise Abatements | A-45 |
| Appendix J: | Reasonable Allowance Certification for Noise Abatements | A-47 |
| Appendix K: | Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service | A-49 |
| Appendix L: | Wetland Delineation Mapping | A-67 |
| Figure B.1 | Section 4(f) Map | A-15 |

Figures

| | | |
|------------------|--|-----|
| Figure 1.1.2-1: | Project Area | 2 |
| Figure 1.1.2-2: | Project Limits..... | 3 |
| Figure 1.1.4-1 | Freeway Level of Service (LOS) Criteria..... | 9 |
| Figure 1.1.4-2 | Intersection Level of Service Criteria (Signalized Intersection)..... | 10 |
| Figure 1.1.4-3 | Intersection Level of Service Criteria (Unsignalized Intersection)..... | 11 |
| Figure 1.2.4-1 | Alternative 2N Proposed Tunnel Cross Section | 19 |
| Figure 1.2.4-2 | Alternative 3N Proposed Tunnel Cross Section | 21 |
| Figure 1.2.4-3 | Existing Condition — State Route 24 Looking East Towards Portals (Oakland Side) | 22 |
| Figure 1.2.4-4 | Two-Lane North Bore Alternative (Oakland Side)..... | 22 |
| Figure 1.2.4-5 | Existing Condition — Route 24 Looking West Towards Portals (Orinda Side) | 23 |
| Figure 1.2.4-6 | Two-Lane North Bore Alternative (Orinda Side)..... | 23 |
| Figure 1.2.4-7 | Three-Lane North Bore Alternative (Oakland Side)..... | 24 |
| Figure 1.2.4-8 | Three-Lane North Bore Alternative (Orinda Side) | 24 |
| Figure 1.2.6-1 | Existing Condition: State Route 24 Looking East Towards Tunnels (Oakland Side)..... | 30 |
| Figure 1.2.6-2 | South Bore Alternative (Oakland Side) | 30 |
| Figure 1.2.6-3 | Existing Condition— State Route 24 Looking West Towards Tunnels (Orinda Side)..... | 31 |
| Figure 1.2.6-4 | South Bore Alternative (Orinda Side)..... | 31 |
| Figure 2.1.1-1 | Existing Land Use in the Project Study Area | 40 |
| Figure 2.1.1-2 | Existing Land Use in the Berkeley Study Area | 41 |
| Figure 2.1.1-3 | Parks and Recreational Facilities in the Project Study Area | 46 |
| Figure 2.1.1-4 | Parks and Recreational Facilities in the Berkeley Study Area..... | 47 |
| Figure 2.1.2-1 | Residential Areas Studied for Growth Inducement Effects of the Project..... | 52 |
| Figure 2.1.3-1 | Socioeconomic Census Tracts in the Project Study Area | 53 |
| Figure 2.1.3-2 | Socioeconomic Census Tracts in the Berkeley Study Area | 54 |
| Figure 2.1.5-1 | Existing and No-Build a.m. Configurations..... | 66 |
| Figure 2.1.5-2 | Existing and No-Build p.m. Configurations | 67 |
| Figure 2.1.5-3 | EB a.m. traffic (2 Lanes) Figure 2.1.5-4 EB p.m. traffic (4 Lanes) | 68 |
| Figure 2.1.5-5 | WB a.m. traffic (4 Lanes) Figure 2.1.5-6 WB p.m. traffic (2 Lanes)..... | 69 |
| Figure 2.1.5-7 | Existing EB & WB Morning Peak Congestion Locations | 69 |
| Figure 2.1.5-8 | Existing EB & WB Evening Peak Congestion Locations..... | 70 |
| Figure 2.1.5-9 | Proposed Two-Lane Bore | 75 |
| Figure 2.1.5-10 | Proposed Three-Lane Bore (simplified) | 80 |
| Figure 2.1.6-1 | Landscape Units..... | 95 |
| Figure 2.1.6-2 | Viewpoint Locations | 99 |
| Figure 2.1.6-3 | Viewpoint 1- Existing view of West Portal from Tunnel Road..... | 102 |
| Figure 2.1.6-4 | Viewpoint 2- Existing view of West Portal from Hiller Drive | 102 |
| Figure 2.1.6-5 | Viewpoint 3- Existing view of West Portal from Broadway On-Ramp..... | 103 |
| Figure 2.1.6-5a | Viewpoint 3a- Existing view of West Portal from Broadway On-Ramp (Viewpoint added 3/29/07) | 103 |
| Figure 2.1.6-6 | Viewpoint 4- Existing view from the Proposed West Portal | 103 |
| Figure 2.1.6-6 | Viewpoint 4- Existing view from the Proposed West Portal | 104 |
| Figure 2.1.6-7 | Viewpoint 5- Existing view of East Portal from Fish Ranch Road On-Ramp | 104 |
| Figure 2.1.6-7a | Viewpoint 5a- Existing view toward East Portal from above Fish Ranch Road On-Ramp (Viewpoint added 3/29/07) | 105 |
| Figure 2.1.6-8 | Viewpoint 6- Existing view of Caldecott Lane looking towards the proposed West Portal | 105 |
| Figure 2.1.6-9 | Viewpoint 7- Existing view from Broadway, north of Lake Temescal, looking west | 106 |
| Figure 2.1.6-10 | Viewpoint 8- Existing view of Contra Costa Road, looking northeast toward State Route 24. 106 | 106 |
| Figure 2.1.6-11 | Cross Section and Plan View of Option 1: Soundwall | 109 |
| Figure 2.1.6-12 | Cross Section and Plan View of Option 2: Berm/Soundwall..... | 110 |
| Figure 2.1.6-13 | Viewpoint 1 (Option 1)..... | 112 |
| Figure 2.1.6-14 | Viewpoint 1 (Option 1)..... | 113 |
| Figure 2.1.6-15 | Viewpoint 1 (Option 2)..... | 113 |
| Figure 2.1.6-16 | Viewpoint 1 (Option 2)..... | 114 |
| Figure 2.1.6-16a | Viewpoint 1 (Option 2)..... | 114 |

| | | |
|------------------|--|-----|
| Figure 2.1.6-16a | Viewpoint 1 (Option 2)..... | 115 |
| Figure 2.1.6-17 | Viewpoint 2 (Option 1)..... | 116 |
| Figure 2.1.6-18 | Viewpoint 2 (Option 1)..... | 117 |
| Figure 2.1.6-19 | Viewpoint 2 (Option 2)..... | 117 |
| Figure 2.1.6-20 | Viewpoint 2 (Option 2)..... | 118 |
| Figure 2.1.6-21 | Viewpoint 3 (Option 1)..... | 119 |
| Figure 2.1.6-22 | Viewpoint 3 (Option 1)..... | 120 |
| Figure 2.1.6-23 | Viewpoint 3 (Option 2)..... | 120 |
| Figure 2.1.6-24 | Viewpoint 3 (Option 2)..... | 121 |
| Figure 2.1.6-24a | Viewpoint 3a (Option 2)..... | 121 |
| Figure 2.1.6-24a | Viewpoint 3a (Option 2)..... | 122 |
| Figure 2.1.6-25 | Viewpoint 4 (Option 1)..... | 123 |
| Figure 2.1.6-26 | Viewpoint 4 (Option 1)..... | 124 |
| Figure 2.1.6-27 | Viewpoint 4 (Option 2)..... | 124 |
| Figure 2.1.6-28 | Viewpoint 4 (Option 2)..... | 125 |
| Figure 2.1.6-29 | Viewpoint 5 | 126 |
| Figure 2.1.6-30 | Viewpoint 5 | 127 |
| Figure 2.1.6-30a | Viewpoint 5a (Option 1)..... | 128 |
| Figure 2.1.6-30a | Viewpoint 5a (Option 1)..... | 128 |
| Figure 2.1.6-30b | Viewpoint 5a (Option 2)..... | 129 |
| Figure 2.1.6-30b | Viewpoint 5a (Option 2)..... | 129 |
| Figure 2.1.6-31 | Viewpoint 6 (Option 1)..... | 130 |
| Figure 2.1.6-32 | Viewpoint 6 (Option 1)..... | 131 |
| Figure 2.1.6-33 | Viewpoint 6 (Option 2)..... | 131 |
| Figure 2.1.6-34 | Viewpoint 6 (Option 2)..... | 132 |
| Figure 2.1.6-35 | Viewpoint 7 | 133 |
| Figure 2.1.6-36 | Viewpoint 8 | 134 |
| Figure 2.1.6-37 | Environmental Lighting Zones | 136 |
| Figure 2.1.7-1 | Area of Potential Effects..... | 141 |
| Figure 2.2.3-1 | Geologic Map | 154 |
| Figure 2.2.8-1 | Relative Loudness..... | 175 |
| Figure 2.2.8-2 | Noise Barrier and Receptors | 176 |
| Figure 2.2.8-3 | Noise Barrier and Receptors | 177 |
| Figure 2.2.8-4 | Noise Barrier and Receptors | 178 |
| Figure 2.2.8-5 | Noise Barrier and Receptors | 179 |
| Figure 2.2.8-6 | Existing Condition– (View from Temescal Regional Park) | 186 |
| Figure 2.2.8-7 | Soundwall 1 Option– (View from Temescal Regional Park) | 186 |
| Figure 2.2.8-8 | Existing Condition–On Broadway, North of Lake Temescal Looking West (Oakland Side)... 187 | 187 |
| Figure 2.2.8-9 | Soundwall 1 Option–(Proposed 12 ft. High Soundwalls)..... | 187 |
| Figure 2.2.8-10 | Existing Condition–Tunnel Road Looking East | 188 |
| Figure 2.2.8-11 | Soundwall No. 2–Option A (Two-Lane Alternative) | 188 |
| Figure 2.2.8-12 | Soundwall No. 2–Option A (Three-Lane Alternative)..... | 189 |
| Figure 2.2.8-13 | Existing Condition–Route 24 Looking West from Proposed West Portal | 189 |
| Figure 2.2.8-14 | Soundwall No. 2–Option A (Three-Lane Alternative)..... | 190 |
| Figure 2.2.8-15 | Soundwall No. 2–Option B (Two-Lane Alternative)..... | 190 |
| Figure 2.2.8-16 | Soundwall No. 2–Option B (Three-Lane Alternative)..... | 191 |
| Figure 2.2.8-17 | Soundwall No. 2–Option B (Three-Lane Alternative)..... | 191 |
| Figure 2.3-1 | Biological Study Area..... | 195 |
| Figure 2.3-2 | Biological Study Area..... | 197 |
| Figure 2.3.6-1 | Resource Management Plan's Primary Study Area | 221 |

Tables

| | | |
|----------------|--|------|
| Table S-1 | State Route 24 Overall Operation Summary- 8 Hour Total..... | xx |
| Table S-2: | Impacts and Mitigation Issues | xxiv |
| Table S-3: | Permits and Approvals Needed | xxxv |
| Table 1.4-1 | Permits and Approvals Needed | 37 |
| Table 2.1.1-1 | Major Approved and Active Projects in the Project and Berkeley Study Areas | 42 |
| Table 2.1.1-2 | Estimated Land Use Changes Anticipated | 43 |
| Table 2.1.1-3 | Existing Park and Recreational Facilities in Project and Berkeley Study Areas | 45 |
| Table 2.1.3-1 | 2000-2030 Population, Housing and Employment Growth | 55 |
| Table 2.1.3-2 | Household Size and Composition | 56 |
| Table 2.1.3-3 | Ethnic Composition..... | 56 |
| Table 2.1.3-4 | Household Income | 58 |
| Table 2.1.3-5 | Impacts from Construction Investment in the Caldecott Improvement Project (millions of 2005 \$) | 60 |
| Table 2.1.3-6 | Minority and Low-Income Populations in the Project and Berkeley Study Areas | 62 |
| Table 2.1.4-1 | Existing Utilities | 64 |
| Table 2.1.5-1 | Freeway Basic Segment Level of Service Thresholds..... | 71 |
| Table 2.1.5-2 | No-Build Eastbound a.m. Peak Period (2032) | 72 |
| Table 2.1.5-3 | No-Build Eastbound p.m. Peak Period (2032) | 73 |
| Table 2.1.5-4 | No-Build Westbound a.m. Peak Period (2032)..... | 74 |
| Table 2.1.5-5 | No-Build Westbound p.m. Peak Period (2032)..... | 75 |
| Table 2.1.5-6 | Alternative 2N Eastbound a.m. Peak Period (2032)..... | 76 |
| Table 2.1.5-7 | Alternative 2N Eastbound p.m. Peak Period (2032) | 77 |
| Table 2.1.5-8 | Alternative 2N Westbound a.m. Peak Period (2032) | 78 |
| Table 2.1.5-9 | Alternative 2N Westbound p.m. Peak Period (2032) | 79 |
| Table 2.1.5-10 | Alternative 3N Eastbound a.m. Peak Period (2032)Alternative 3N Eastbound p.m. Peak Period..... | 80 |
| Table 2.1.5-11 | Alternative 3N Eastbound p.m. Peak Period Alternative 3N (2032) | 81 |
| Table 2.1.5-12 | Alternative 3N Westbound a.m. Peak Period (2032)..... | 82 |
| Table 2.1.5-13 | Alternative 3N Westbound p.m. Peak Period (2032) | 83 |
| Table 2.1.5-14 | Eastbound SR-24 Operation Summary..... | 84 |
| Table 2.1.5-15 | Westbound SR-24 Operation Summary | 85 |
| Table 2.1.5-16 | Intersection Level of Service Criteria..... | 86 |
| Table 2.1.5-17 | Existing Intersection LOS | 87 |
| Table 2.1.5-18 | Year 2032 No-Build Intersection LOS | 88 |
| Table 2.1.5-19 | Year 2032 Alternative 2N Intersection LOS | 89 |
| Table 2.1.5-20 | Year 2032 Alternative 3N Intersection LOS | 90 |
| Table 2.2.6-1 | Comparison of Air Quality Mainline Conditions..... | 167 |
| Table 2.2.6-2 | Summary of Project Level Diesel PM and MSAT Emissions (grams/day) | 169 |
| Table 2.2.7-1 | SES Results and Jet Fan Requirements | 171 |
| Table 2.2.8-1 | Activity Categories and Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC)..... | 173 |
| Table 2.2.8-2 | Summary of Noise Abatements Considered | 184 |
| Table 2.2.8-3 | Summary of Noise Levels | 185 |
| Table 2.3.1-1 | Permanent Natural Community Impacts in hectares (acres) of Build Alternatives for Caldecott Improvement Project | 202 |
| Table 2.3.2-1 | Jurisdictional Features Mapped within the Delineation Area | 204 |
| Table 2.3.3-1 | Impacts to Urban Trees by Species for Either Build Alternative of Caldecott Project | 207 |
| Table 2.3.4-1 | Invasive Species Noted in the Project Area During May 2004 Surveys | 209 |
| Table 2.3.5-1 | Special-status Plant Species | 212 |
| Table 2.3.5-2 | Special-status Species Impacts for the Build Alternatives | 217 |
| Table 2.3.6-1 | Consistency with the Resource Management Plan for the Caldecott Corridor | 222 |
| Table 2.4.11-1 | Temporary Natural Community Impacts in hectares (acres) of Build Alternatives for Caldecott Improvement Project | 241 |
| Table 2.5.3-1 | Cumulative Impacts Project List..... | 252 |

